



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/765,778

01/27/2004

Lane Thomas Holloway

AUS920030987US1(4029)

2464

45557

7590

02/25/2008

IBM CORPORATION (JSS)
C/O SCHUBERT OSTERRIEDER & NICKELSON PLLC
6013 CANNON MOUNTAIN DRIVE, S14
AUSTIN, TX 78749

EXAMINER

HASSAN, RASHEDUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/765,778	Applicant(s) HOLLOWAY ET AL.	
	Examiner RASHEDUL HASSAN	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/21/2007 has been entered.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

Configuration module 207 as mentioned in [0027] is not shown in Fig. 2.

Client transmitter 255 as mentioned in [0028] is not shown in Fig. 2.

The drawings are also objected to for minor informalities as mentioned below:

The specification mentions “common Interface 210” (see [0027]), but the reference sign 210 points to “RECEIVER” in Fig. 2.

The specification mentions “receiver 225” (see [0026]), but the reference sign 225 points to “MAPPING MODULE” in Fig. 2.

The specification mentions “interface 220” (see [0027]), but the reference sign 220 points to “Transmitter” in Fig. 2.

The specification mentions “transmitter 235” (see [0026]), but the reference sign 235 points to “SERVER RECEIVER” in Fig. 2.

The specification mentions “server receiver 260” (see [0028]), but the reference sign 235 points to “EXECUTOR MODULE” in Fig. 2.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended to recite, “...*wherein the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions translated into the common format in XML to the inputs on the common interface of the client device without changing code at the client device and the server device*”. The Examiner notes that the phrase “inputs on the common interface” refers to the particular GUI elements on the common interface of the client device (e.g., the claims recite, “*mapping, after receiving, of the commands and the options to inputs on the common interface, thereby producing mapped inputs..*”).

Similarly, the specification mentions, “Through logic associated with the client device, the user configures 310 what are termed **inputs on the common interface**. The inputs may take the form of drop-down boxes, check boxes, radio buttons, text entry boxes, scroll-through boxes, or may simple be buttons, all of which may appear on a screen on the client device 105” [0031]). As such, the claims can be interpreted to require that the XML file having a common format (i.e., the “common format” has been interpreted to mean an XML file adhering to a generic schema) is converted at the server

device to the GUI elements of the common interface of the client device. This essentially amounts to the mapping of the XML file to the GUI elements of the common interface at the server device, which has not been described in the original disclosure. The original disclosure nowhere teaches that the server device has knowledge of the GUI elements that are available at the client device, which would have been necessary in order to convert the XML file to the inputs on the common interface at the server device. The original disclosure only teaches creating an XML document adhering to an XML schema that contains the user interface descriptions, i.e., the commands and options available at the interface of the server device (see [0023-0024] and elsewhere in the instant specification), then sending the XML document to the client device so that the client device can map the commands and options of the XML document to the inputs on the common interface. Furthermore, the limitation “***without changing code at the client device and the server device***” also has no support in the original disclosure since the invention is only realized by installing logic enabled by software to both the client and server device, which necessarily results in code changes at the client and the server device.

The respective dependent claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement for their dependency from the respective independent claims.

For the purpose of art rejection, the limitations “***...wherein the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions translated into the common format in XML to the inputs on the common interface of the client device without changing code at the client device and the server device***” recited in independent claims 1, 10

and 19 have been interpreted to mean that the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions into the common format in XML to be used as input to the “inputs on the common interface” of the client device.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As mentioned hereinabove, claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended to recite, “...*wherein the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions translated into the common format in XML to the inputs on the common interface of the client device without changing code at the client device and the server device*”. As such, the claims can be interpreted to require that the XML file having a common format (i.e., the “common format” has been interpreted to mean an XML file adhering to a generic schema) is converted at the server device to the GUI elements of the common interface of the client device. This essentially amounts to the mapping of the XML file to the GUI elements of the common interface at the server device, which has not been described in the original disclosure in such a way so as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. The original disclosure nowhere teaches that the server device has knowledge of the GUI elements that are available at the client device, which would have been necessary in order to convert the XML file to the inputs on the common interface at the server device. The original disclosure only teaches

creating an XML document adhering to an XML schema that contains the user interface descriptions, i.e., the commands and options available at the interface of the server device (see [0023-0024] and elsewhere in the instant specification), then sending the XML document to the client device so that the client device can map the commands and options of the XML document to the inputs on the common interface. Furthermore, the limitation “*without changing code at the client device and the server device*” also has no support and enabling disclosure in the original disclosure since the invention can only be realized by installing logic enabled by software to both the client and server device, which necessarily results in code changes at the client and the server device.

The respective dependent claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with enablement requirement for their dependency from the respective independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 19-26 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 19-26 are directed to a “machine-accessible medium” containing instructions. The instant specification provides proper antecedent basis for the terminology “machine-accessible medium (see [0009]). The instant specification does not provide any explicit (e.g., limiting definition) for the terminology. Therefore, the question becomes whether non-statutory embodiments would be fairly conveyed to one of ordinary skill in the art given the terminology utilized. In this instance, the Applicants have provided intrinsic evidence of embodiments intended to be covered within the meaning. One of the covered embodiments is “signal-bearing” media or “communications medium”, e.g., “computer or telephone network, including wireless communications” (see [0035]). Thus, it appears that the claimed “machine-accessible medium” is intended to cover “signal” and therefore, considered to be directed to non-statutory subject matter under the meaning of 35 U.S.C 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-12, and 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marques (US 2004/0001095 A1) hereinafter Marques.

For claims *1, 10 and 19*, *Marques teaches a computer implemented method for a client device* (see [0010], [0013], and [0062], also see Fig. 2) *having a common interface* (see Abstract: "The user interface provides users with a common look-and-feel for managing all devices". Also see [0002], [0008-0009], [0013], [0053-0056]) *to interact with a server device having an interface* (see [0010], [0013], [0062], also see Fig. 2), *the method comprising:*

receiving, by the client device, of user interface descriptions from the server device, wherein the user interface descriptions comprise commands and options of the server device translated, at the server device, into a common format in XML (e.g., Marques teaches transmitting user interface descriptions from the server to the client device using schema and instance data as shown in Fig. 4 using common format in XML as illustrated in Fig. 5-9. Also see "Summary of the Invention", [0037], Implementation section described in [0059-0064], schema described in [0087-0108]);

mapping, after the receiving, of the commands and the options to inputs on the common interface, thereby producing mapped inputs at the client device, wherein the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions translated into the common format in XML to the inputs on the common interface of the client device without changing code at the client device and the server device (e.g., Marques teaches that the Layout Handler 42 and the Schema Handler 40 at the client device interprets and maps the commands and options to the inputs on the common interface, see the paragraphs mentioned

above and also “Schema handler” in [0112-0113], “Layout Handler” in [0120-0123]); *and transmitting a selected one of the mapped inputs from the client device to the server device for execution by the server device* ([0126]).

For claims 2, 11, and 20, Marques further teaches *executing the selected one of the mapped inputs received by the server device* (see [0126] and [0129]).

For claims 3, 12 and 21, Marques further teaches *the executing comprises reading xml associated with the selected one of the mapped inputs transmitted to the server device, and performing the selected one of the mapped inputs* ([0129]).

For claims 4, 14 and 22, Marques further teaches *prompting the client device for the mapping* (e.g., the term “prompting” can be interpreted to mean “To move to act; spur; incite”. Marques teaches having the client device perform the mapping, i.e., prompting the client device for performing the mapping).

For claims 5 and 23, Marques further teaches *configuring, by the user, of the inputs on the common interface of the client device* (see the discussion for “User Preferences”, [0116-0118]).

For claims 6 and 24, Marques further teaches *prompting the client device for configuring one or more of the inputs on the common interface* (e.g., the term “prompting” can be interpreted to mean “To move to act; spur; incite”. Marques teaches a client device for presenting one or more inputs of a device-independent common interface. Also see the discussion for “User Preferences”, [0116-0118]).

For claim 7, Marques further teaches *the receiving of the user interface descriptions comprises receiving xml files* (Fig. 6, 8-9, also see discussion regarding “Schema” in [0087-0108]).

For claims 8 and 25, Marques further teaches *the receiving and the transmitting comprises, via wireless communication between the client device and the server device* (see 37 in Fig. 4, and the section for “Wireless Communication Infrastructure”, [0065]).

For claims 9, 18 and 26, Marques further teaches the mapping comprises interpreting the user interface descriptions and associating each of the commands and the options with the inputs (see [0096]).

For claim 15, Marques further teaches the client device comprises a portable device (see Abstract, [0025]).

For claim 16, Marques further teaches *the client device comprises a PDA* (see [0025]).

For claim 17, Marques further teaches *the server device comprises a vending machine* (e.g., Kiosk type devices listed in Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marques in view of Margalit et al. (US 6,763,399 B2) hereinafter Margalit.

For claim 13, Marques does not teach *wherein the server device comprises a functionality reduced to an add-on device*. according to the instant disclosure, the logic, enabled by software and/or hardware on the server device 115 for sending the user interface descriptions 122 to the client device 105 may be integral to the server device 115, or the functionality may be reduced to and encompassed within an add-on device in communication with the server device 115, wherein the add-on device operates as the server device 115 by connecting to a vending machine or other device through, for example, a USB port on the vending machine or other device. Marques teaches the server device comprises a functionality reduced to a light weight server application that is embedded on the device referred to in standard network management parlance as an agent program. However, obviously such an agent program can be embedded in an add-on device communicatively connected to the server device. Margalit teaches a system and method of reducing a smart card functionality of a host system to an add-on portable device that has a USB interface for connecting the portable device with the host via USB protocol and a microprocessor for controlling the transfer of data via the USB interface and a smart card chip for performing the smart card functionality. Margalit essentially teaches a method of reducing some functionality of a host server to an add-on device. Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Marques with that of Margalit in order to reduce the functionality of sending the user interface descriptions to the client device to an add-on device. The motivation would have been to provide the mobile population the benefit of using the invention using existing conventional devices equipped with USB interface (Margalit, column 1 lines 16-20).

Claims 1-12, and 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. (US 6,502,000 B1) hereinafter Arnold in view of Hirota et al. (US 2003/0158898) hereinafter Hirota.

For claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19 and 26, Arnold teaches *a method for a client device* (12 in Fig. 2) *having a common interface* (e.g., Arnold's controlling device itself represents a "common interface" since it makes available to the user the same interface functionalities of the controlled device, although in a different form according to its' capability. In addition and in the alternative, the controlling device with its' User Interface is a client device "having a common interface" because a single device is used to control many different controlled devices, thus the device itself works as a common interface to the user for controlling multiple devices) *to interact with a server device* (11 in Fig. 1) *having an interface, the method comprising: receiving, by the client device, of user interface descriptions from the server device, wherein the user interface descriptions comprise commands and options* (21 in Fig. 2, also see column 2 lines 4-43);

mapping, after the receiving, of the commands and the options to inputs on the common interface, thereby producing mapped inputs at the client device (22 in Fig. 2, also see column 2 lines 4-43), *wherein the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions translated into a markup language* (see claim 7) *to the inputs on the common interface of the client device without changing code at the client device and the server device* (e.g., controlling device need not be adapted in any way to the function of the controlled device, see c4:7-9, also see column 2 lines 4-43); *and*

transmitting a selected one of the mapped inputs from the client device to the server device for execution by the server device (24 in Fig. 2).

Arnold does not explicitly teach that the commands and options of the server device is translated into a common format in XML. However, Arnold teaches that user interface descriptions from the server device is provided to the client device in a markup language (see claim 7). The limitation "a common format in XML" can reasonably be interpreted to refer to "a document in common (i.e., universal, well-known) XML format". Hirota also teaches a computer implemented method for a client device having a common interface to interact with a server device having an interface (see previous Office Actions for details) and further teaches providing the user interface description to the client device in XML (Fig. 21A and 21B, also [0141]). Therefore, given the explicit suggestion in Arnold to use a markup language for providing the interface description to the client device and the teaching of Hirota exemplifying use of a file in XML format as the markup language of choice, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a file written in common XML format to provide the user interface description to the client device and thereby arrive at the present invention.

For claims 2, 11, and 20, *Arnold further teaches executing the selected one of the mapped inputs received by the server device* (25 in Fig. 2, also see column 2 lines 4-43).

For claims 3, 12 and 21, Hirota further teaches *wherein the executing comprises reading xml associated with the selected one of the mapped inputs transmitted to the server device, and performing the selected one of the mapped inputs* ([0188]).

For claims 4, 14 and 22, Arnold further teaches *prompting the client device for the mapping* (e.g., the term “prompting” can be interpreted to mean “To move to act; spur; incite”). Arnold teaches having the client device perform the mapping by allowing the display options to be matched to the capabilities of the controlling device (see c2:34-43), i.e., prompting the client device for performing the mapping).

For claims 5 and 23, Arnold teaches *configuring of the inputs on the common interface of the client device* (since the display options are matched to inputs of the client device configured according to the capabilities of the client device). However, he does not explicitly teach that the configuration of the inputs on the common interface of the client device is done *by the user*. However, Hirota teaches *configuring, by the user, of the inputs on the common interface of the client device* (see [0205] for user configuration). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arnold and Hirota to allow a user configure the inputs on the common interface of the client device to arrive at the present

invention. The motivation would have been to allow the user configure the interface of the client device according to his/her preference.

For claims 6 and 24, Arnold further teaches *prompting the client device for configuring one or more of the inputs on the common interface* (e.g., the term “prompting” can be interpreted to mean “To move to act; spur; incite”. Arnold teaches a client device for configuring one or more of the inputs on the common interface and thus teaches the limitation of the claim).

For claim 7, Hirota further teaches *the receiving of the user interface descriptions comprises receiving xml files* (Fig. 21A and 21B, also [0141]).

For claims 8 and 25, Hirota further teaches *the receiving and the transmitting comprises, via wireless communication between the client device and the server device* (see [0093]).

For claim 15, Arnold further teaches *the client device comprises a portable device* (e.g., a handheld device, c5: 31).

For claim 16, Hirota further teaches *the client device comprises a PDA* (see [0199]).

For claim 17, Arnold does not teach *the server device comprises a vending machine*. However, he mentions that the controlled device can be any device capable of external control (see c3: 33-34). Hirota also mentions about desirability to control a vending machine using a controller (see [0013]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to modify the combined invention to control a server device which is a vending machine. The motivation would have been to improve the user's convenience (Hirota, [0013]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 11/21/2007 have been fully considered.

Applicants have argued that Arnold result in changing of code unlike Applicant's claimed invention and pointed out c9:56-63 of Arnold allegedly showing a teaching of such code change. However, the Examiner disagrees with the Applicants on this point. The Examiner sees no evidence in the cited portion of Arnold's disclosure requiring a code change. Furthermore, Applicants provided no explanation and it is also not clear what "code" is referred to by the limitation "without changing code at the client device and the server device" and how such limitation is in conflict with Arnold. The Examiner notes that c9:53-65 mentions of "Device Code" which is said to be the term used for logic needed to tie the JetSend protocols into an actual device. Arnold mentions that JetSend is an architecture according to which devices transfer information directly without need for intermediaries where network considerations allow (see c5:45-48). Arnold mentions of JetSend architecture with regard to one application of the principles of his invention. However, the Examiner did not rely on the JetSend architecture for any of the rejections and the principles of Arnold's invention is not limited to using JetSend

architecture for information transfer between devices. Arnold specifically mentions that any medium and associated protocol can be used for exchanging messages between two devices according to the principles of his invention (see c3:38-44).

Applicants further argued that Arnold does not teach interface descriptions in a common format in XML. The Examiner acknowledges that Arnold does not explicitly mention using XML. However, the argument is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as discussed in detail hereinabove. Similarly, other arguments presented by the Applicants are also moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as discussed in detail hereinabove.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RASHEDUL HASSAN whose telephone number is (571)272-9481. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rashedul Hassan/

/Weilun Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179